



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,170	12/29/2005	Peter Le Lievre	AUSLTD-008US	3694
76082	7590	05/18/2010		
K&I. Gates LLP				
IP Docketing				
630 HANSEN WAY				
PALO ALTO, CA 94304				
EXAMINER				
BASICHAS, ALFRED				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3743				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/18/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,170

Applicant(s)

LE LIEVRE, PETER

Examiner

Alfred Basichas

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/3/10.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-29, 31, 32 and 34-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-29 and 31, 32, 34-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/3/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 16-29 and 31-38 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-33 of copending Application No. 10/563,171. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite the same general invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 16, 19-23, 25, 29, and 31, 32, 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033) in view of Fungler (6,543,441). Sick teaches substantially all of the claimed limitations. For example:

A carrier and drive arrangement for use in a solar energy reflector system and which comprises: a) a carrier structure having i) a platform 11 for supporting a concave reflector element 15, ii) a frame portion that includes hoop-like end members 26 between which the platform extends, and iii) support members 29,30 which support the frame portion by way of the end members and which accommodate turning of the carrier structure about an axis of rotation that is substantially coincident with a longitudinal axis of the reflector element when supported by

Art Unit: 3743

the platform; and b) a drive system incorporating an electric motor for imparting turning drive to the carrier structure (see at least col. 3, line 67 - col. 4, line 4), wherein the platform comprises a panel-like platform (see at least figs. 1-3) which is formed with stiffening elements 12,24 in the form of corrugations and wherein the reflector element is supported upon the crests of the corrugations, wherein the platform comprises a panel-like platform which is formed with stiffening elements in the form of flutes 12,24 and wherein the reflector element is supported upon the crests of the flutes, wherein the stiffening elements are orientated to extend in a direction parallel to the longitudinal axis of the reflector element (see at least figs. 1-3), wherein the stiffening elements are oriented to extend in a direction parallel to the longitudinal axis of the reflector element (see at least figs. 1-3), wherein the platform is curved concavely in a direction orthogonal to the longitudinal axis of the reflector element (see at least figs. 1-3), wherein the reflector element is secured to the platform in a manner such that the curvature of the platform is imparted to the reflector element (see at least figs. 1-3). Sick further discloses struts 32 connecting opposite ends of the curved transverse frame members 12 to the spine 28 via hoops 26.

Nevertheless, Sick does not specifically recite the claimed channel/roller arrangement or the platform being separate/nonintegral from/with the reflector.

As regards the channel/roller arrangement, Fungler teaches a solar collector including a channel/roller arrangement (see at least fig. 12). Such an arrangement clearly provides for effective load bearing and weight distribution. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the channel/roller as taught by Fungler into the invention disclosed by Sick, so as to provide effective load bearing and weight distribution.

As regards the reflector and platform being separate/nonintegral, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated nonintegral components in the invention disclosed by

Sick, since it has been held that where constituent parts are combined so as to constitute a unitary whole, the unitary whole is deemed integral. *In re Larson*, 144 USPQ 347. Accordingly, the reverse holds true as well.

6. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033) in view of Fungler (6,543,441), and further in view of Butler (4,559,926). Sick discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. While the combination of Sick and Fungler teaches a transmission of motion from the electric motor acting on the periphery of the circular ring 26 (Sick), it does not specifically recite imparting drive by one of the end members. Butler teaches a solar collector drive arrangement including hoop element 18, with surrounding fixed chain 30, end members 20, and motor 22 driving the hoop element via the end member (see at least figs. 2,3). Butler teaches that such an arrangement provides a low cost drive system (see at least col. 1, lines 45-48). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the drive details taught by Butler into the invention taught by Sick in view of Fungler, so as to provide a low cost drive system.
7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033) in view of Fungler (6,543,441), which combination teaches substantially all of the claimed limitations. While Sick inherently includes a radius of curvature to enhance the concentration of sun light, Sick does not specifically recite the claimed range. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the claimed range into the invention taught by Sick in view of Fungler, since it has been held that where the general

conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable values or ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233; *In re Swain*, 156 F.2d 239. See also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages.").

8. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033) in view of Funger (6,543,441), which combination teaches substantially all of the claimed limitations. While Sick discloses metal mirrors, Sick does not specifically recite the use of glass mirrors. Official Notice is given that the use of glass mirrors in solar concentrators is old and well known in the art. Such an arrangement has the clear and obvious benefit of providing for efficient reflection and concentration of sunlight. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate glass mirrors into the invention taught by Sick in view of Funger, so as to provide for efficient reflection and concentration of sunlight.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim have been considered, but are not deemed fully persuasive and/or are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection necessitated by the amendments to the claims.

- a. Applicant asserts that the Double Patenting rejection should be withdrawn, but fails to provide any reasoning to support the statement. Applicant is advised

that the claims substantially recite the same subject matter even though the language is not identical. Although minor differences are recited, such as the concave shape of the curved frame member recited in 10/563171 and not in 10/563170, are not unobvious. If applicant persists in the belief that there are substantial differences, then such differences should be pointed out. Applicant is advised that a terminal disclaimer would more easily overcome the rejection.

b. Applicant further asserts that the chain in Butler is not fixed to form a gear wheel. Nevertheless, while not "integral" the chain is fixed to the wheel, given the term "fixed" broadest reasonable interpretation. While Butler's system is not identical to that disclosed in the instant application, the claims are not unobvious. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

c. Applicant's late traversal of the Official Notice is moot, as it has already been taken to be admitted prior art in view of applicant's non-traversal of the assertion in the response to the office action in which it was made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

Art Unit: 3743

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.

May 17, 2010

/Alfred Basichas/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3743